

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of June 1, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11, 13 and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,953,707).

Huang does not teach or suggest the instant claims for all the reasons recited in the response filed March 17, 2005 hereby incorporated by reference.

The Office Action recites:

Huang discloses a Demand Node where the customer information product requirements are characterized (Figure 38). (Office Action, page 5, paragraph 2)

Product requirements are the number and type of products the customer desires to fill his inventory (Inventory Node). There is no indication that the customers request the products based on desired material and desired processing. In fact, the Production Node provides information on product information, bill of materials, etc. That is, the process used and supplies needed to make a product are decided by the producer of the product, not the customer.

The Office Action recites:

Huang discloses Demand Management 81 where the process by which the customer's requirements are characterized with the specification of prevailing uncertainty (col. 12, lines 51-54). The process involves the development and maintenance of customer forecasts (col. 12, lines 54-56). These forecasts are initially developed in periodic joint meetings or communications between the decision makers of the enterprise and the customers (col. 12, lines 56-58). (Office Action, page 5, paragraph 2)

This relates to communications between the customer and the suppliers to *forecast* what the customer is likely to need from the producers in the future. This is a demand for future products not a demand whereby the customer selects the desired material and desired processing. The Demand Management is to make sure that products *likely to be ordered* by the customer will be available in the future. Hence the products are produced based on forecasts, and the customer orders the products as needed. This assures that a sufficient supply of the products is available.

The instant claims, on the other hand, are for real time requests of specialized commodities *based on desired materials and process*. The system of the invention receives the request from the demander and then looks for suppliers and processors that can fulfill the request.

The Office Action recites:

Huang discloses Demand Review 144, which consolidates demand information received directly from the customer (col. 18, lines 53-55).

Again, this relates to requests from the customer to the producer for products the producer should have in stock based on previous forecasts, for example. This is not a system for custom orders whereby the demander selects the desired material and desired processing through a computer and the system finds suppliers for the demanded commodity.

The Office Action states that customer product requirements are developed in joint communication with the customers and the decision makers. The "decision maker" in the instant claims is the demander who requests the material and processing whereby the system responds by locating suppliers and producers that can supply the request. The decision maker in Huang is not the customer, but instead is one who makes sure products are available for the customer when the customer wants to refill his inventory.

The Office Action speculates that the demand information received directly from the customer are considered the demander of the commodity having input on desired material or processing which affects the quality of the end products. Huang does not disclose that the customer demands certain material or certain processing. In Huang, the customer selects from existing products or products created by a single supplier based on forecasts. Thus, this statement can only be made based on hindsight application of the instant invention.

Huang does not teach or suggest the claimed feature that the demander (customer) selects the desired materials and processing or that the demander places a specific order through a computer. The claimed system uses the requested information to find the suppliers to provide the product. This is a real time request and not based on forecasts made by a plant manager or sales manager who is a decision maker (see the summary of the invention.) The claimed process does not require meetings and customer forecasts.

Huang does not teach each element of the instant claims as required by the instant claims. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claims 10, 12, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. and further in view of the "Earth-friendly good" article.

Huang does not teach or suggest the invention for the reasons discussed above. The "Earth-friendly good" article does not remedy the defects of Huang. Although the article describes using thinned-out wood to make, for example, furniture, the article does not describe any system to allow information on desired wood material, desired production place, and desired processing from an end user to be matched with wood available from thinned-out woods, production places, and available processing.


The article is unrelated to the system of Huang and there is simply no reason one skilled in the art would have substituted thinned-out wood for the products described in Huang. However, even if the raw material of Huang was thinned out wood, neither teaches or suggests a system based on the demander's need. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: 8/2/05

By: 
Susan A. Wolffe
Registration No. 33,568

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001